

September 1, 2006

Via E-Filing

Hon. Edward M. Chen
 Magistrate Judge
 United States District Court
 Northern District of California
 450 Golden Gate Avenue
 Courtroom C, 15th Floor
 San Francisco, CA 94102

**Re: *Synopsys v. Ricoh Company, Ltd.*,
 Case No. C03-2289 MJJ (EMC)
Ricoh Company, Ltd. V. Aeroflex, Inc., et al.
 Case No. C03-4669 MJJ (EMC)**

Dear Judge Chen:

We write to seek a clarification regarding two contradictory Court orders entered this afternoon regarding Ricoh's pending motion for protective order (Synopsys Dkt. Nos. 447 & 448). Dkt. No. 447 orders the parties to abide by the Defendants' proposed language; Dkt. No. 448, however, orders the parties to abide by Ricoh's proposed language (and does not reference Dkt. No. 447 in any way). Defendants respectfully request the Court issue an amended order to make clear which order it intended to enter.¹

Respectfully yours,



Ethan B. Andelman

EBA:sg

¹ Should Dkt. No. 447 be the intended order, Defendants note a minor inconsistency in the order. In the prefatory language of the order, the Court states that it found the limitations offered by Defendants, including the limitation that documents be "created by or for Dr. Papaefthymiou" to be reasonable. However, in the points following, the order reads that the documents must be "authored by Dr. Papaefthymiou." Based on the prefatory language, Defendants believe this language should read "authored by or for Dr. Papaefthymiou." Should Dkt. No. 447 be the intended order, clarifying this scope will allow the parties to understand precisely the bounds of the Court's order.